
BUENOS AIRES – ALAC Leadership Team Meeting
Friday, June 26, 2015 – 09:00 to 12:00
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

ALAN GREENBERG: Am I still a bull elephant?

We're not sure, but there is a dragon out there with his fire breath. Are these on?

Okay. It is on. I'm hoping you can hear me. Ron says no, Tijani says yes. I think you have to move closer to the speakers, wherever they are then. Maybe we can get the speakers up a little bit. Any better now? Good. Okay.

Thank you all for the one final meeting of the week. This has been a long week for some of us. I'd like to welcome to David. We will try to keep interventions at a reasonable length. David, that's not referring to yours at this point. I'll nudge you if it is. We have about 15 minutes with David, not as long, because as usual, we are starting exactly 15 minutes late, which seems to have been a standard for this meeting, not only for At-Large, but virtually every meeting that I went to started late.

Interesting, I'm not quite sure why since the venue probably has the rooms closer together than they normally are.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Accept the CWG, CCWG.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

ALAN GREENBERG: He says accept the CWG... No, some of those started late also. At least some did. Anyway, it doesn't... We don't need to debate that. David, I don't think we had anything specific on the agenda. Certainly we've heard you've got some more money, so we're a little bit interested in hearing about that, and where the policy staff will be deployed. And I certainly have one or two comments on where we made additional work, and the floor is really yours for anything you would like, for the few minutes that we have.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you Alan, and all of you, thank you. This is the last day. Steve Crocker and I stand between you and departure. I'm sorry about that. But it's always helpful and useful for me to talk with you after the meeting first.

I think, I would like to point out and congratulate all the SOs and AC groups for their work. And looking at the CWG proposal, it was, as you know, approved almost unanimously by the groups, and sent on to the coordinating group. That's a major accomplishment in addition to all of your other work that you're doing, and I think it's a great demonstration that the multistakeholder model is alive and well.

And that the ICANN SO and AC structures are live and working very hard. So I thank you for that. Only I might add that we should have a new, new meeting strategy, and either elongate meetings to three

weeks, or I look forward to the meeting B, where we'll only have four days of kind of quiet and maybe restful discussions. I don't know.

But we'll see what happens as we move forward on the reconfiguration of those meetings. Just a little recap of the numbers at ICANN 53 in BA. We had 380 sessions. And of that, the policy development team supported 160, probably over 160 of those. About 20 to 30 of those 160 were focused on transition and/or accountability work, and the others, of course, council meetings, working group meetings, your meetings, and the like.

That's up from the last session. I think we were 150 in Singapore, but that's about the level we're talking about. And I only raise that because that, of course, means that we as the policy team are supporting you, but it's more indicative of the work you're doing. And I raise that and show that number 160, in my discussions with Fadi, global leaders, and others, who listen to me in speeches, that this is an example of the level of work and activity at an ICANN meeting.

So I thank you for all of that hard work. Obviously throughout the week, we had sessions, usually our normal sessions with the community leaders on Friday. They were still looking at three work streams. One relating to prioritization. Another one related to information management and accessibility, that is to say, the ease of finding information on ICANN's massive sites.

And the third, looking at the development of our volunteers and how to attract new ones. And that, there is a very extensive community activity matrix, that shows the various working groups and meetings

across the SOs and the ACs. This is the first time this was ever done, to provide an overview of at least, on the policy side, that you and your other colleagues are doing.

And this is a step in the direction of understanding how best to plan our focus meetings. For example, we've heard from the chair of the SSAC, Patrik Fälström, that this was useful in determining when they should be issuing some of their advisories, because of course, they want to make sure it's understood by others. And this would be hopefully the use of this document.

Fadi presented it to the Board of Directors and they were amazed. Again, I'll link to the 160 sessions that we support. And I think this is very good to get that overview of what we're doing. I think it also reflects a breakdown of the silos of the SOs and ACs. When I first joined some five years ago, they were all doing their own work, but they were less look at across the groups.

And I think there is much more of that and I think that it's healthy for ICANN, and for policy development in that advisory board. So with that, of course, the Monday session, the high interest topic, and other topics, for Monday. And I want to thank everyone for contributing to that. That's always a work in progress, of how best to handle the representation on the stage.

We try the two panel approach. And we'll try to find a way to best represent your views. One way for the RALO leaders, I think, there are options, an option that you participate in such a session. And you

might want to think, well maybe if we're in the European region, a EURALO rep will sit up there, and talk about the region, if you will.

But you can think about how you might want to restructure or look and use that Monday discussion pattern. Tuesday, of course, we changed the, trying to change a little bit with Steve Crocker's view, and we'll ask him when he comes, the interaction with the Board. And I think that roundtable approach, even though it was a square table, the roundtable approach, I think, was a step in the right direction, of having more interaction with those relevant Board members who either focus on the topics of interest to you, or linked to those groups.

And I thought that worked out well, and we'll look to doing that again in Dublin. So if you have any comments or modifications you suggest to that, please let us know. And I think Steve and others will be asking more formally, but you can, of course, relate them to me and I would be happy to hear them.

I think that's a healthy change. And then of course, all of the other sessions you've been working on. Despite the focus on transition and accountability, the regular work as I'm calling it, continues the GNSO talked about, five milestones in the policy development process. Moving things forward, your work here, SSAC, RSSAC, continues to form their advisories and the GAC, in record time, issued their communique.

I guess the 4 AM pizza time was not really the best approach to things, and there it's really quite organized. And I'm glad to see that as another improvement. And so those are the highlights for this

meeting. I thought it was, again, hectic and busy. I'm kind of tired, but I'm satisfied, I'm pleased that the SOs and ACs showed that the work can be done, and quality work was done, and people recognize that.

Multistakeholder is a lot more, stable model is alive and well, and that's because of you people here. Thank you. I open it for questions.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Two brief ones from my side. And then I'll see if anyone else has any. In terms of the Board meeting, with one or two concerns, on the Board side, which we'll deal with Steve on. We were happy with the Board interventions. There was a large amount of dissatisfaction on the At-Large side, restricting it to six people, when it's billed as an ALAC Board discussion, was really problematic.

So. And second of all, that table with several people, including the Chair of the Board and the CEO with their backs to the audience, was not optimal. So a number of other details I won't belabor the point right now.

I had another point which I had forgotten. So we'll go to the queue and maybe one of them will remember what I didn't say. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan. Olivier for the transcript. And thanks for this summary of all of your activities, and all of the developments we've seen in BA ever since the last meeting that we had over in Singapore. That sounds like such a long time ago. I'm interested in

particular with the growth in the number of FTEs in the policy department.

And I wanted to find out a bit more detail on how you see this work on the ground. I think we saw in the budget, is it two additional FTEs for policy? How will those be shared, and how does one get, I don't know... I'm not exactly sure how much of it will be helping with the ALAC. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thanks to the comments. And other internal discussions about the need to properly resource the policy development department. Those extra monies were allocated. The two FTEs we were thinking of. One would probably be into the policy side, a subject matter expert. The other one to bolster our SO AC support side.

So that's our thinking at this stage. And that would, again, help the staff in general by providing some staff relief for that. There would be some monies involved for professional services. We do have two or three consultants who provide outside assistance to us, that is shared across the SOs and the ACs. More recently we've loaned them, if you will, to Theresa Swinehart, to help that in the CWG efforts, as well as some of our senior policy teams, in that important effort. And so, some of that will hopefully be coming back to support our efforts.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anyone else?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you David. As somebody who served on the high interest topics panel, there were a couple of management issues in that session, and actually one of our RALO leaders walked off the stage because he didn't get a chance to speak. So I think, in future ones, we have to figure out a way that people get their time and the time is better managed. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Point well taken Garth. And our initial reaction was that the moderator was not on top of the game at the time. We've decided... And that's, he has other things to do and it's not his fault per se. We're going to take that and moderate it ourselves, because we know the people now.

We're trying to figure out the staging, and that's why we used Brad in the past. But we think now we can do it, and now that we know people, we'll take care of that. So thank you. Good point.

ALAN GREENBERG: León.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Alan. This is León Sanchez. David, I'm not sure if this is even a question for you, but I was wondering whether we're making progress on serving those underserved committees? Remember, we've been speaking about how the fellowship program is

restricted to developing countries, and only applications from those countries can be actually successful. And we've been trying to push this program to admit applications, not only from developing countries, but also from underserved communities in developed countries, like some European countries or maybe the States or Canada, that actually do have these communities that would need to be called in.

I just want to ask whether you have any updates on that?

DAVID OLIVE:

León, thank you. And I've heard these comments too. I think that's a very good point. The Fellowship Program, and more recently, the Next Generation program, is, I think, a successful program to reach out and engage groups that normally don't come to ICANN meetings. The Fellowship Program was designed with the encouraging people from the developing world, in particular, the assumption, rightly or wrongly was, others can take care of themselves.

And the Next Generation with much younger people with a similar criteria. Over time, as the program was just beginning, people said, "Okay, fine. The way you have divided the selection process, wouldn't it be good to also have...?" In the past, there has been requests for more focus on the business constituency, for example, young entrepreneurs, or law enforcement.

Or, in other words, expanding the criteria of people that you're selecting. And I think there was some resistance to that because they

wanted to, you know, keep it focused and make sure it would work. And now that it has shown to be a very successful model, I think now would be the time to say, “Okay, great. It works. You’ve got the system in place. You’ve got the selection process in place, let’s add a new category, or two or three categories that would help us.”

And even if it’s... We like to say this at ICANN, the pilot project, try it out. You know, one from each of the categories to have three or four, to see how that works, that could be another way of engaging the other areas, other people and other groups that you want to stress. And I think now that that program, fellowship is stable and runs very well, I think they would be, now is the time to ask for that. Time for a chance, so to say.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much David. I couldn’t have had a better setup, thank you very much. We agree with you completely. We thought that... Several people around this table are ex-fellows. We have had marvelous success. The program works. It has demonstrated, but it’s also has demonstrated how difficult it is to get someone into the ICANN system.

So, we do believe that there are worthy people of the same caliber, in developed worlds, in the developed world. I also personally believe, and we haven’t discussed it in ALAC so I won’t attribute it to anyone else, that this would be a marvelous program for the developed world.

There are groups within universities, there are all sorts of people akin to young entrepreneurs, but not in the business sense, that we can't reach because it's too difficult, or they don't know about us, and this would be, again, a marvelous opportunity. And we thought the time was right ripe also.

And we talked to Janice, and she was willing to take on more people, so we put in a budget request, which was refused. So, everyone seems to agree it's perfect. We were willing to take five people three people, just to demonstrate the case, and we didn't get that, and that was very disappointing, I must admit.

DAVID OLIVE:

There is another budget year, we're already starting FY 17 year planning. Even from the policy department it wasn't until yesterday that I thought there would be more resources. So it was an internally difficult and challenging time, but the concept is getting there. And that's the important part. I've talked to Janice as well, and I would be happy to relate that further with her and Nora.

Because I think the concept is right. We just have to now, you know, kind of refine some extra new categories with the help of the SO and AC leaders in At-Large. I think that's the way to go.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just for the record, so you know, I've also talked to Janice, and asked her, what if we got money from the auction fund for another 100 people? And she said fine. With appropriate resources. Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. Maureen for the record. As Alan says, a lot of us have come from that Fellowship Program, and it's a fabulous program. And I know that, you know, that we know is coming through. There are very few people coming through from the Pacific, and I know that every meeting there has been at least two. You know, one or two.

And young people, which is just fantastic. The only thing is that there is still hundreds. And the only thing I think that the current program of the current program, focusing on developing countries, I mean, you're looking at Africa and Latin America, and the Pacific. There is still a need there. And perhaps for the developing countries, if they do decide to go down that track, of course, you're looking at a different sort of like side of things that may need another program totally.

But I do believe that when there are, within the developed countries, there are underserved communities. And they could be included in the developing countries sort of like [inaudible] because they, you're meeting sort of like a different demand, a different need for information and awareness.

So I think that that the current model fits the group that it's actually targeted towards at the moment. But I can understand that there are other groups. And I guess this is one of the reasons why we're talking about outreach. That, you know, the sort of outreach that we can be funded to do, to get out to those, and this people with our expertise are really going out into the communities, and touching base with those groups. Thank you.

DAVE: Thank you Maureen. The question I would like to have, and I just don't know the details, do they have some sort of program or way to, for alumni in the region? And could ALAC and the RALO groups or ALSs kind of help out in making sure that that is kind of a connecting point as well?

Regional vice presidents may want to host something or hold something that would include them to kind of keep their interests involved within ICANN?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you David. I mean, that's one of the things that I've actually am a little bit concerned about, with respect to say the Pacific Fellows, is that because it's so spread out, we have had an opportunity where we can actually select [inaudible]. And I'm sure that, I'm sure that some would agree that some sort of...

This is when we are talking about regional meetings, that would be an ideal opportunity to gather the fellows, the alumni together, to get some feedback about how their Fellowship attendance has had an impact in their own particular areas of our region. So it gives another focus for strategy that we're looking at.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know that Heidi wants to get in on that, and I'll let her speak next. Siranush also... But Heidi has a very short and important

intervention. I will point, looking around the room, I think we have more Fellows here than we have non-Fellows, to show how good the program is in terms of volunteers.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Just briefly, just to let everyone know that if you weren't aware on Sunday, several of the RALO chairs to the Fellows room for the first inaugural sector standup, where the Fellows were invited into the groups that they associated with, Civil Society, end users, etc. and, I think, we had a lot of good work results based on that dialogue between the Fellows and ALAC.

And the second point is that there is now an action item based on Jimmy's proposal to have a formal interaction during future ALAC meetings with the Fellows. So we're moving ahead on that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Siranush.

SIRANUSH VARDLANYAN:

Thank you Chair. I'm sorry for my voice, I got flu, as usual. I mean this is becoming [comedic], the last day of ICANN, and flying back, and... Go to bed. So related to the Fellowship, we actually, it's already a couple of times that APRALO members are going there, trying to find people from the region, and we can also show the success that we have more, a couple of new ALSs joining us based on what we have

discussed here and people are going back to their countries, communities, and decided that this is the place they would like to join.

We did like with ISOC Palestine, was that they case, ISOC Delhi was the case, so many of them. And the mentorship program and [inaudible] program is working well there because you know that a number of Fellows are increasing and increasing, and the way they... To keep that balance, many [LMIs] are working through the process of them coming actually in person, work as in mentors, as a guidance for the newcomers to come.

And this proves to be really, really working process. As if the number will be increased more, this may become not as effective and productive as it can be, so that balance should be kept anyway. But the NewGen has the criteria, has no limitation from developing country or from where. NewGen is based in the region. I also kind of like this information to share with ALAC people.

Wherever ICANN meetings takes its meeting in one of the region, so people from that region can come. So if it goes to North America, then people from North America can come to NextGen. So there is no limitation from the region from developing or developed countries. So that also can be used by, and NextGen is fellow [inaudible] people.

So this also can be a way to involve people from developed countries as well. So just thoughts.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm closing the queue on the subject. You're on next, but the queue is closed after you. Just we have a few minutes to go onto anything else we have.

DAVID OLIVE: I'll reserve my comment, please Barrack,

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you David. Just to add my voice on the Fellowship. I think we've seen tremendous growth in terms of participation of our colleagues from the African continent. And looking at my country, Kenya, I think we've had more than five different Fellows coming, and now it's increasingly easy to hold a meeting within the country, where we can discuss ICANN issues, because we can have a critical mass.

And I think that's helping some of the mentors in our region like Tijani, who really try to make a great effort to make sure that ICANN is understood in the communities, making their work extremely easy. And just looking at this meeting, I could count more than 10 or close to 15 Africans who are here, and more and more they're engaging positively in the discussion within the different SOs and ACs.

So I think the most important thing about the Fellowship program is the exposure to different cultures, and different ways of working. So I just want to agree with what León is saying. It shouldn't be assumed that only people from developing countries need the exposure. There might be cases in the developed world that may need this exposure

and the inter-cultural exchange, and so we could look at it from that perspective.

DAVID OLIVE:

Yes, a comment. I don't know if you can do this or if you think of it interesting, but one way might be to have the alumni fellows as advisors to the RALO chairs, as kind of honorary advisors or something, to kind of keep their interest within the group. And I like the idea with meeting with the current Fellows, when the RALO leaders are here. I mean, that's another way of trying to link the programs together, and make it more ICANN related.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much David. One of the other hot topics we're on, and it was something that we were hoping to have gotten, more actively started right after Singapore, but unfortunately other things came up, is the whole issue of how to reinvigorate and connect with RALOs, with ALSs and their members.

We have lots of ALSs, we keep on getting more on board, we don't see a lot of active people coming out of them in general. We have contact typically with the signal representative from an ALS, but often, we don't really know what's going on. So we're going to be focusing on that. And I hope we'll be moderately successful.

It is going to take staff time to do this. One of the things that we're going to have to do is a newsletter tailored for the ALSs. A lot of the information is going to come from the monthly policy updates and

things like that. There is probably going to have to be some stuff that is tailored specifically for ALSs, in addition, there is just no way we can spend a lot of time admitting an ALS, and then lose touch with them completely.

So we're going to start looking at... It's a proposal. It hasn't been accepted yet, looking at annual reports or biannual reports from them. So that we keep good records and know who is an ALS, how big they are, and when we're asked that the new CEO was going to, you know, some interesting country around the world, that we can, with confidence, say this is someone you should talk to.

You may want to make a visit to the ALS. Right now, if we did it, it could be rather embarrassing. So that will take time. And we don't have any plans right now, so I can't tell you how many person hours we're talking about. You know, per day, per week, per month. But it is going to be a resource. We're going to need support on. There is just no way volunteers can do this, and do it equitably across the regions. And be able to essentially have the, our arms in the field be a really effective part of ICANN, which sadly, they are not right now. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE:

If I could comment on the concept of an ALS newsletter. This is not as difficult as it first may sound, because we also have regional newsletters, that ICANN puts out, which is again, based some of the inputs, public comments, and what not. And we're trying to now work with communications to make sure that that's more coordinated. It

had initially been part of the initiatives of the regional vice presidents. And you saw some in Latin America, and then you saw some elsewhere.

I'm in charge of the [inaudible] one that comes out, for example. And we want to make sure that they have consistent messaging, but also some customized approaches to it. Maybe that could also be further, as a base, customized for the ALSs. So that's something to talk to John and Duncan about.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you David. And I implied that, maybe I wasn't as clear as I could have been. So you know, it may take some assembling, but most of the information is done, I hope, a lot of this is done in ways that someone who isn't an ICANN junkie, can understand, if not it has to be for other people in any case. So I'm presuming it is. But there is going to be specific work that we're going to have to do to tailor it.

You know, just to make it look like we're tailoring it, even if the content is the same as other documents, and helping to collect the information, sift through it, make sure that we have contact. So, just a heads up. The details will be forthcoming, hopefully. I'd like to have a decision of the ALAC by Dublin, whether we'll make it or not remains to be seen.

DAVID OLIVE:

And the other good news about using, or latching on to regional newsletters, is they're also done in the languages. So you have, right

there, the Spanish for Latin America and others, and that's an easy, quick way of utilizing better the resources that we are doing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking. And thank you David for mentioning the languages. I've forgotten to latch onto that. That is part of your department, is it? The overall...

DAVID OLIVE: It is not.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

DAVID OLIVE: Mr. [Kuek] is in charge of language services.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Okay, no problem then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record. At the open forum yesterday, a young woman from China got up and talked about language services, and Fadi misunderstood the question. He praised what great language services

we have, except she was talking about the CWG, the CCWG and/or the CCWG both of which we requested language services for and were refused. And those meetings have been held exclusively in English, both at ICANN meetings, and teleconferences, and the face to face meetings.

So just for the record.

Anyone else? Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Tijani speaking. It's not in my area how big, but I would like to say I am really satisfied with the, that's right, with the language services in ICANN. I think that we made a lot of improvement. Frankly speaking, I don't think that we can make more, except for translation, because translation, we still have a long way to work, to get it.

But for interpretation, I don't think we can make better than we are making it now, at least for At-Large. And also for the main hall, where you have more than the UN languages, very good interpreters, very, very good interpreters. Here, I can certify that they are now, they understand very well our language. They make very good translation. And I am really satisfied.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I can only support the last comment. We heap praise on our interpreters at the end of our meeting yesterday, because the quality of the interpretation, and getting all of the buzzwords and stuff, is

really working. We can't do better in quality, I believe, we may need to do better in variety of languages. That's really something I can't judge.

It depends on the demographics of people who are coming, although it's a circular issue. If you don't have the languages, you're not going to get the people. We do need to do better, and I know it's an enormously expensive thing, that if we want people involved in the decision processes that go on within ICANN, whether it's policy issues or the administrative ones that we've been focusing on, we really need to serve them better in other languages. Thank you.

Garth, Olivier, is that a new one or an old one? That's a new one. So Garth and then Olivier.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you. Garth Bruen. So I would like to see, and I think many other people would like to see, a way that we can elevate access to the deaf and the blind to the same level that we provide for language services. And that we really embrace this global community that, you know, it is an interpretation. It is an interpretation and it's an access issue.

And really elevating the access for the deaf and the blind at ICANN, would not only be good for At-Large, it would be good for the global community, it would be good for ICANN and we also, it would be a public relations coup for ICANN, to do this properly. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: I think that's interesting, and I'm going to put it in terms of another language services. That is something that I think we're trying to do in small steps, but I think an importation to have. Captioning and other things that we're trying to do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Olivier speaking. And another question, which might not be your department. I now that the SSAC has been working on some kind of system to help them with policy. And it's either IT based, but also, I guess since it's policy you sort of involved a crossover between the two. Do you have information on that? Because it's something obviously that's of interest to us, since we're also working on our own policy process management system.

DAVID OLIVE: Again, thank you Olivier. That's part of the community leader's work streams in terms of priority, information management, and volunteering and engagement. That they're looking at the Chris Giff's team, along with some of the people who support of the SSAC, are looking at some sort of document numbering, or document management, as a pilot project.

And that's moving forward. The hope is that if they could do it at a small scale of a SSAC in their advisories, that could be expanded. And

so, the whole point is to test that out with that group, and they're moving forward on that. So we heard a little bit of a report today, this week, from Chris Gift on that, and as soon as we have some greater details, we'll share it with the wider community.

But the whole point is, as a test that works for them, we'll try to make sure that it goes to others.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you David. We have a comment from the chat, and I know David has a hard stop in about six minutes, so if we can keep interventions short to try to make sure that everyone has a chance. Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks Alan. This is Ariel for the record. We have a remote participant, Olivier, and his comment is, "Africans are really interested to participate in this multistakeholderism process inside of ICANN. We need more and more awareness among different stakeholders, government, private sectors, Civil Society, academia, and simple users."

We also have a comment from remote participant [inaudible], raising awareness of an interesting ICANN detailed [inaudible] is difficult locally. A local ARS will be attending to many other Internet related issues, perhaps if ICANN regional were more engaged at the local level, these other non-ICANN issues, this would at least raise ICANN's profile within the local communities.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you for those questions from remote participation. I guess it is true, and this will probably be the next phase for our regional vice presidents in their work, we were looking at how indeed to better engage the regional interests, and there are some talk now to have a program where there would be, kind of, have a webinar specifically for that to talk about either issues under public comment, or some of our proposals, to help customize it for people in the region.

So that's going forward and being planned, and I think that would be another way to have to have more of a focused presentation. And if we can involve the RALOs and the At-Large structures, I think that's the intent, so much the better.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. We have about three minutes. Anyone else?

No hands. I made a suggestion, comment, at the AFRALO African meeting that based on the fact that AFRALO was the only group that had done something formal in terms of comments on the, the only one of our RALOs, that had done something formal regarding the CWG, CCWG, we perhaps need to disadvantage other parts of the world, to try to get them up to speed, in that line, since electrical problems and a flaky telecommunications problem is one of those criteria, Olivier you may be next to really...

You're continually telling us how bad the telephone system is in your part of the world.

We're talking Switzerland, UK.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: France in particular, very deprived as far as telecommunications are concerned. And strikes, and taxes.

I'm not speaking loudly on purpose. It's early in the morning for some of us.

I've got a question. It's Olivier speaking. I have a question on a discussion that we had, I think, a little while ago, on the possibility of perhaps having some interns in At-Large, that could help with drafting documents or clean up the website, or this sort of stuff. We've got so much to do and our staff is so overstretched for some of these background tasks which are often repetitive, and which I would say are below their pay grade.

And I remember there was a talk about this and I haven't seen since much movement on that front. So I wonder whether we could find out what's going on. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Yes. And that, with the budget approved for FY 16, we do have a pilot project to help in document drafting, and/or this type of services. And we'll be organizing that rather quickly. We've sent a note around to the chairs, and there have been consultations about how best to do that.

But there will be some resources available for that purpose. For At-Large.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much David. We really appreciate the fact that we started late, but you still gave us the 45 minutes, actually, our schedule only to have 40, and we had 45. So thank you very much. We'll let you go to your next appointment, assignment, whatever. And we will be in touch as we go on. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE:

And just give Steve Crocker a good time.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. The next session, or section is, did not have a particular detailed agenda. The title is strategy going forward. I'd like to do a little bit of a debriefing. If anyone has any issues that they want to raise about this meeting, that have not already been raised in one form or another, but I'll give a preamble.

I have not had such a, I've not seen such a hectic meeting between the CWG, CCWG, the meetings that we carved out of our time, and the meetings that many of us were committed to, I think it was about 10, 12 hours, between 10 and 12 meetings carved out of our meeting week, or out of our evenings in some cases.

To focus on that, and that has put an immense amount of pressure on our overall schedule. We cut out speakers or visitors who we thought

were not critical to what we were looking at. And the ones that were left, we squeezed the time, and then as I mentioned at the beginning, we seemed to be beginning many meetings late for whatever reason. So it has been a rather hectic meeting, but and we'll certainly try to do better as we go forward.

If anyone... Anyone has anything else they want to put on the agenda in terms of how we, the scheduling was done, how we, you know, what we need to do better next time. Next time is going to be an interesting meeting. The CCWG is hoping to get ratification of their report, at the Dublin meeting. I'm hoping, given that it's a few months away, that we will not be doing that down to the wire.

And we'll have a fair amount of time to be able to comment on it prior to the actual meeting. But that remains to be seen of course. Comments. León.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Alan. This is León. Yes, planning schedule was very challenging, as Gisella will testify, can attest to that. Having this very important subjects for ICANN and the community on the transition, is something that has proved to complicate things when program our meetings.

So, I do thank you for your comprehension and for your understanding, because it has been very challenging. And I think that we'll need to find out a way to begin planning for A, B, and C meetings,

because that's going to change the whole scale for us. So, any suggestions are very welcome.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well we have a new, I'm not sure if it's a working group, a working party, the new buzz word in ICANN, that will be focusing on that. And I ask you, within the, well around here we have the ALT and a variety of other people who are simply interested. And we thank you, participate. It's really easy to put the task on someone else, and then complain afterwards that it wasn't done properly or to your liking.

You've really got to participate. And of course, like everything else, there is going to be lots of compromises made. But get into it early and there is more chance that what you're looking for in a meeting will actually come out of it.

Look around the table. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. I think that the effort put in making this schedule, this program was huge. And I recognize the big work done by Gisella and León. And thank them, I thank them very much. But I think that this time, it is not about scheduling, about making the slots, but how are we spread the work we have.

And those small slots this time, because this time we had other things to do so that's why we had less time for our ALAC work. I think that discussing the same issue in two sessions, or three sessions, is not a

hefty thing. We have to prepare ourselves before doing that, if we feel that we need a lot of brainstorming or a lot of discussion about it, first send all the elements we have to the list, to people who are interested in that.

Making and telling them that we will discuss them in a face to face meeting in Buenos Aires, please think about it. We will decide on this, on this, on this. And then we make only one session for that. We will win a lot of time, in my point of view. Second point, I think that our business, our internal business, in the future should be for the face to face meetings, should be, how to say, well arranged so that we make the substance in such a way that, we, it is more harmonious, if you want.

We don't' jump from something to something other, which are not close or related. So those are thoughts, but it is not a criticism at all. I know it is, this time, especially in Buenos Aires, it was impossible to do better, but in the future perhaps, if we try to improve in this way, it will be better.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Certainly after Buenos Aires, I think any meeting will seem delightfully relaxed. Two specific comments on what you said, and I agree with everything, or three comments. Number one, in terms of the visitors, we have to work around where we can schedule people. And as you know, we often change things at the last moment.

So, it's not always under our full control. We were in a particularly awkward situation here, because at the time we were setting agendas, we didn't know where we were going in terms of even the CWG and certainly not the CCWG. A lot of the stuff we talked about was only determined on Friday, and so not really a lot of opportunity to send things around.

All of that being said, I think you're right. We do need to focus on it, and that needs feedback from other people. A lot of the schedule this time around was deferred to the very last moment, but a lot of it wasn't, and is on the Wiki. We talk about it on ALT meetings, we talk about it in ALAC meetings, we get virtually no feedback.

So, if people see something that, you know, some hot topic that they want on the agenda, there is no guarantee that we're going to fit it in, but if you don't mention it, we're probably... We may think of it, León make think of it, Heidi may think of it, or we may not. So speak up and speak up early. We wait, quote, waste all of that time talking about meeting agendas on our teleconferences, because we really do want feedback, never mind want it.

One of the things, as we go around, we have a few liaisons here, if you have anything that you want to raise that wasn't raised in a public meeting that you think needs to be focused on and please don't hesitate, but I'm not going to ask for explicit reports. We've already done enough of that. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And I know you've mentioned earlier meetings after this meeting will probably feel great, and we'll have much more time on our hands, and so on, but that's what I've been thinking when I was chair for four years.

I thought the next one we'll do less, and unfortunately, the next one, there was always more going on and more going on, and new toys, or new toy topics that were coming up to get everyone attentive to something else to frenzy about. And so my view on the ICANN meeting and the At-Large schedule is that any gaps will completely fill up its container.

Unfortunately. And we do have a lot of things to do, and I guess in other meetings... Even at the meeting here, if we didn't have the IANA stewardship transition, and the ICANN accountability, we would have probably had more working group, more working groups meeting with each other. And so ultimately, this is just a very busy week for us, and we're used to that.

And we are the busiest group in ICANN. I'm sorry. I've looked around at everybody else's schedules, we are the busiest group because we have to deal with absolutely everything in this building, whilst others just deal with their own little part of their green patch, and don't really bother at the rest.

So yeah, that's just a fact of life. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear. When I said they're going to be a lot easier, I mean we may not have quite as many 7:00 AM meetings, and we may actually have some level, and we may, there were may's there, not will, and we may have an opportunity to do some of the background work that we're supposed to be actually doing, instead of being focusing on something that was somewhat out of our control.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Dream on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I saw a card up from Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, Gisella for the transcript. A quick question. When we planned the Singapore meeting, with León, the format was actually choosing a hot topic for the meeting, and then building the meeting around that, especially with regards to the working groups. Because it's very difficult when we've got limited number of slots to add all the working groups as well.

So just an idea to, maybe moving forward, do we decide on a hot topic and then see which working groups would be the most relevant to that topic? Is that something that could be considered? We're just trying to put as many meetings in as possible, and I know we've set a not starting before 8 AM, but when the schedule comes out, and the only slot available is 7 AM, we try and accommodate all of the meetings.

We really do our best not to start, and this week we've had three starts at 7 AM or 7:30. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Comments on the subject of a high interest topic theme for our meetings? Julie? No? Any response on that. No? I have one. I don't think it works. I think we have to let the dynamic flow and see what's important, and us deciding ahead of time that one theme is the important theme, and emphasizing those at the expense of what other parts of At-Large and ALAC thing, they have to focus on, take the opportunity to face to face, I think we have to go with the flow more.

That's my opinion. Olivier has...

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking...

ALAN GREENBERG: Before Olivier starts talking, however, we... Steve is coming in at 10:45, so we have a hard stop at that point.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. It's Olivier speaking and very sarcastically. So high interest topic, how do we get more money? And I'm raising this because throughout the week we have been asking, well, participating in various different forums, and I'm a little concerned that somehow

often it sounded like this community is just asking for more money to bring more people into ICANN meetings.

And yet, people who speak, the people who are involved in all of the other forums, are always the same few number of people, and that's being seen. And there is a discrepancy between asking for more funding to actually bring more people to ICANN meetings, and on the other hand, actually just having the same people present on all of the working groups, present on all the different things that are happening at ICANN.

I think we need to look at that quite carefully, because it doesn't reflect very well on our community, and it certainly is something that might come back in our face at some point. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's already coming back in our face. Do you have any suggestions?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: I don't. And this is why I think we need to discuss this, at some point. That could be a special high interest topic.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Sadly, just one quick comment. There were... I did get some reaction at the ALAC Board meeting all we were doing was talking about money. When ICANN refuses to do reasonable things and claims money is the reason, it's hard to not talk about money. Julie.

JULIE: Thanks Alan. Julie speaking. We've sort of moved on from when you were talking about liaisons, but I was just going to mention that, as you're aware, the SSAC has been involved in the CWG stewardship, but not the CCWG accountability, partly for resource reasons and partly because SSAC considers it has a very narrow remit, and that was a very broad remit.

But I think one of the things that we've learned is that we do really need to keep a close eye on what's happening in that CCWG, because it could well affect us in ways that aren't necessarily advisable for the way we operate. And I just wanted to say that, my ability to keep up to date, to some degree, by listening in on the ALAC discussions has been incredibly helpful.

And having now, before this meeting, taking the time to read the documents from both cross community working groups, I'm going to try to stay up to date, and try and support SSAC in keeping up to speed, particularly on the CCWG accountability. And so I thank all of you for being so on top of that topic, that it has helped me to have some better insights and formulate views as well.

So you may well find that I continue to use the ALAC as a good way of keeping myself informed, so that I can assist the SSAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Julie. You know, of course, those of us that are moderately involved, or heavily involved in the CCWG, you can talk to

us offline. And you're not limited to just listening in on calls. So certainly from my perspective, you know where to find me, and I'm sure the rest of the people... And we don't always agree. So you may want to talk to two of us and see why we're yelling at each other.

But anytime you'd like. Who else?

We can take a half hour break.

No, no, I wasn't rushing you, I was simply pointing out what our time was. We have Sébastien and then Jean-Jacques.

SEBASTIEN BACHOULETTE: I wanted to pick on the topic of the CCWG. I think we are good, we are in a good place where we can also try to have our liaison from each and every SO and AC, come together to a discussion on that topic, because it would be interesting to know how they feel themselves about what SSAC, or the ccNSO, or the GNSO is thinking about.

We can have a better understanding of where the whole organization is going. I am very concerned by the fact that currently the CCWG, it's a circus where everybody can talk, and we never get to try to get any consensus. It's the one who speak, I am the other who at the end get the way we are going.

And we may... I know that we, among the five people representing At-Large, we sometime disagree, sometime agree. We talk together, we chat. But I really think that one call or two between now and Dublin will be useful, where we engage with the liaison, to know where we

are, and maybe also to have some message going from ALAC to those bodies on that topic. And it exists, because it's a hot one, but I think that it could be taken for other topics, as we are really one of the few, if not the only one, who have liaison almost everywhere, except GAC for the moment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. I think I would like to... Jean-Jacques, if you'll indulge us, we'll stay on this topic, because I think there is probably a few comments on it. And then we'll come to you afterwards. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Olivier speaking. And I didn't quite understand what you meant by the liaison. Are you saying, or GNSO and ccNOS liaisons? Or with the SSAC, okay, fine. I think that would definitely be helpful. It appears both the SSAC and the ALAC are growing in the same direction, I would say, or leaning in the same direction.

It appears that the ccNSO is also... Okay. Let's be clear. As far as the membership model is concerned, for example, it appears that both the ccNSO, the SSAC, and the ALAC were broadly against the membership model, whilst the real debate was going on in the GNSO, between the different stakeholder parties, stakeholder groups.

I think yeah, it would certainly help to try and get some cross community discussions going. I don't know whether that means inviting our liaisons or even some people from the other component organizations, who are on the weekly IANA issues call. Certainly we're

going to have to continue our own issues call very soon, and continue on the work to be able to prepare ourselves for Paris.

It's an important high stakes process, and there are certainly concerns that I've heard from many people that you always hear the same people speak in the room, very opinionated characters, very high personalities, and you have a room of 150 people and only eight are speaking. What I did hear, however, is that when people from At-Large are speaking, that was much more the voice of reason than some of the other stuff that we heard in the room. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much. In French we call that [French]. Anyway. I think that, since we are talking about CCWG accountability, I think that we are approaching a very important phase of our work, and I think also that we need very, very, very huge consultation and coordination between us, because we will have to agree or disagree after that.

We will have to make inputs. And it is better to have, not the same thing, I don't ask that everyone thinks in the same way, we may disagree, but at least we inform each other. We try to give insight, perhaps I didn't understand something and that's why I gave this position. So the rest is to consul between each other. We are five people, not too much. We have to consult. We have to build, perhaps, a position. If it is possible. If it is not possible, it's not a problem. We

may have more than one position, but if we can build one position, it would be very good for the future of our work.

And I am sure that now we have, in front of us, on the table, a proposal that is more perhaps more acceptable, but as the French people say, [French]. So, the details are very important. And as I said in the session, if we don't have the whole details, with the whole legal aspects clearly explained, we cannot have a real position, because we saw before that we had an advice from the legal advisor that wasn't really right, and that made us take a position that wasn't the right one.

So, I think that in the future, in those weeks, few weeks, we need a lot of work and a lot of coordination.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I put my own hand up in relation to liaisons, but just in relation to the overall work, talking to people last night, I get the feeling that with one or two exceptions, there is a fair amount of agreement of, you know, focusing on what is now being called the empowered designator model. And if we can do that, then we have to start ticking off the details.

You know, one by one, there is the review panel that people have some concerns with, and the details are very important. There is the reconsideration one. There is, you know, removing Board members, and the bylaw, the wording about the bylaw approval. And budget, but that's good, because something like the CWG, we can segment that into independent parts.

The CCWG, I have a strong criticism in that the work party that were created at the very beginning tend to be doing all of the work, and the rest of us are sitting around waiting for the result. And I think we have to divide it into smaller pieces and get more people involved in that process.

So you know, that's a different world then we're in two days ago, when the big answers, we were not anywhere close to closure. And of course, we still have a few people who disagree completely. And that has to be addressed.

In terms of the liaisons, certainly when I was GNSO liaison, I spent a fair amount of my time trying to tell the GNSO what we were thinking about issues that were relevant, and bringing it back and keeping people alert as to what the hot topics were, in the GNSO. And I suspect that although the intersection is larger, for the GNSO and ALAC, the same is true with the other groups.

So I do think we are doing that on a regular basis. In the case of the CWG, CCWG, perhaps we do need a more focused attention to it. León.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Alan. This is León. With regards to building consensus, you might agree that handling a group of more than 150 people might be somewhat challenging, when coming to consensus.

So from perspective as co-chair from the working group, there is always something that can be approved, of course. But I would like you to... I would like to share my perspective with you, from the point

of view that, for example, with legal advice. We've been told from the beginning that the designator model wasn't going to work, and now we're ending in an empowered model, which it all comes back to us.

And it seems somehow impossible to say, okay, so we were pushing for a designator model from the beginning. We were told that that wouldn't work, and then we're back to square one, saying, okay the designator model is the way to go. I think this is not a bug, but instead a feature, because we were able to widely discuss the different models on the table.

And we as co-chairs, of course, have been envisioning a strategy for the overall process. And the time since, it seems clear for us the path that we want to follow, but of course, there are sometimes that we are fairly, or pretty much as confused as you are. And what I would like to tell you at this point is that, there might have been some turn around on the strategy, and that is because we not only want to favor the wider discussion within the group, but also don't want to implement any top down decisions.

You might have seen that we have been very encouraging of the discussion. And it would have been maybe easier for us to say, okay, the membership model is the way to go, maybe it's left by not having a wider discussion on the subject, and we might as well have called for consensus already.

A month ago, a month and a half ago, maybe. It wouldn't have passed. That's a fact. I mean, if we would have called for consensus, one month ago, we would have created more chaos than easiness on

the group. So, the next steps for us as we said in the closing remarks in our last meeting, is to have the different SOs and ACs tell us, as co-chairs, where our priorities are.

What are those things that we definitely need to see included in the proposal, what are those things that we definitely don't want the proposal to include, and what are those things that we could live with if they are included in the proposal?

Because this will provide us a wider perspective and a wider view on the different interests that all the SOs and ACs are bringing into the table. And we can, of course, try to begin calling for consensus at the level of saying, okay, maybe the ALAC doesn't want to have these or those situations left in the proposal, but then the CCNSO might be asking for something that needs to address something that the ALAC doesn't want to accommodate in the proposal.

So we need to go to common grounds, and we need to get to middle points in which we can both live. So that is the next step for us. We hope to have this finished before Paris, so in Paris we can sit with all of the different participants and members of the group. And we can finally get to a point in which we can call for consensus.

I think we're getting there. I mean, the progress since our pre-meeting on Friday, before beginning the actual ICANN meeting, was a complete turn of events like we were going to the right, and now we're going completely to the left. So I think, while it was like a change in direction of what might be a very, I mean, a sudden change of

direction, I think that it was something useful, and it was something that the group needed to do.

So with regards to having few people speaking in the meetings and the calls, that is unfortunately not under the chair control. That is something that we want to encourage. We always ask for wider participation, we always ask for volunteers. And we do agree that the work has been developing in too few hands. There is too few people working on this, and we want to expand this to more people.

As you said, we will be calling for volunteers to address the new issues that were raised by the public comment, in between those, with regards to internal accountability. The SOs and ACs accountability. And we will be probably forming a working party three or a working party four. We will be going back to basics because we have... I remember we had five working parties in the beginning. So we might be going to another scheme like that.

But we really need to move forward, really quick.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We are starting to run out of time. We have several speakers in the list. We have me, Tijani, and Maureen. And Jean-Jacques wanted to go on to a different topic. So if we can try to keep interventions really brief, otherwise we're going to run out of time. Sorry, Sébastien, sorry. I'll add you to the list.

I think I'll close the speaker list at this point, however. León, just for the record, I wasn't criticizing how we were doing until now. I think

now it's time for a change, not unlike what the CWG had to do, because the dynamic is different. If you look at the interventions in the last couple of days, for those who have participated, from Athena and Jordon Carter, they're a different tone than they were a while ago.

And basically, it's time to stop posturing, and come to closure because you're right. If we can't come to closure on the overall major decisions before Paris, we are not going to make our deadline. So Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. León, I have a big admiration to our leadership in this working group, really. And I expressed it several times. We have a really full team on the leadership. They are different, they are complimentary, but they are very smart. Imagine, we finish our work, we go eat, we go sleep, etc. They don't. They go work.

And tomorrow morning, they come up with a new thing, with a new... And this is the standard of this leadership, they are making proposals. What was missing in the CWG, at the beginning. There was not a proposal from the leadership, they are making proposals. And this is wonderful. And I really congratulate you, because you are really effective and sufficient. And I think our work will be good because you are good also.

Alan, I was speaking about legal details about the model, not about the other things, about the model itself, because now we have, what we have, we have a drawing. We have blocks. But how it will work,

what is inside. I agree with the general framework, but I don't know what is inside.

So this is what I asked for, and I went to Vicky and I told her, please, very, very big details, legal details, and if it is possible from two sources, so that we are sure the legal advice is right. Last thing, I think the work done already is very good. I think that we are not far from reaching the right consensus.

And the most important for me is not to reach the consensus very soon, it's to reach the consensus, assist consensus, a consensus that will be really a consensus. Until the end. And for which everyone will agree. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Maureen for the record. Just to raise an issue in relation to the ccNSO. I must admit, I don't know actually whether I'm sort of like involved in their conversations. I am on their council list. One of the things that I have noticed is in there, in the reporting that their co-chairs provide, they are very general, and basically reflect what I'm already hearing from the ALAC reports.

And if I want to know more, I basically have to watch the, and listen in on the ALAC webinars. But I think that in relation to the ccNSO at council level, for example, the main thing has been on process, and

that really there was some discussion within, especially within the CCWG about the decision making and how it was to be, and how they would go about deciding the ccNSO viewpoint at these meetings, because there was one person who was, had a view that was completely different.

And that actually took over quite a lot of the council time, and so there was list on the content, and more on the process. So I'm, and I take a point on finding out more from, like for example, Jordan, hasn't been able to provide us with a report because he has been really busy with other things.

So I will talk to him more about what is going on.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Our last speaker on this topic is Sébastien, and we have about eight minutes before Steve comes in, and we did ask Jean-Jacques to delay his intervention. So if we can, allow some time for him, I would appreciate it.

SEBASTIEN BACHOULETTE:

I will be very brief. I really think that we need to organize the next meeting differently. There are a member of the working group, and I know we want to, everybody equal, everybody but at one moment, we need to see, I don't know what is the feeling of the member of the working group, I know that when we talk, and I would very much be happy to have the working group seated here, and some time to have on resource to explain their point of view.

Because I have the impression that there are some vocal people who are going in one direction, who are not the one who are supposed to be [inaudible] the community. I have no problem to have them speaking, but at one moment in this process, we need to see where the members want to go. And that's, I don't know. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We can certainly organize a talk. You do say, we have five members but one of them we have allowed to be the chair, who is attempting to maintain a level of impartiality.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETTE:

It was not among us, it's all of the member of the CCWG, I don't know where the working group is, because people like [Malcom] is not a member of the working group. He's very, very vocal, and he's coming back and back and back, and it's a little bit different.

I would be happy also to have, but it's done at the group meeting call that Olivier share. We need to maybe discuss again, even with the chair or the co-chair the position of each member of ALAC. Give me the opportunity to say, I am not sure that we need to have the same position. And the fact that, this organization, it's not just the SO and ACs.

It's also the region, it's also the language, it's also the culture, it's also something else. Then we need to be free, but we need to discuss together. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll point out that the, no. We're off of it. The ground rules were that members and participants are equal accept for consensus calls. That was the ground rules we worked on. It may have been a mistake, but so be it. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT Thank you Alan for giving me this opportunity to present to you a proposal I would be making in any case to the Chair of the Board, and to Fadi, whom I will be spending some time with in Sao Palo at the NetMundial coordination council meeting. But being from ALAC, and having very much appreciated my two terms with you, I thought it would be quite natural if I submitted this proposal first, before speaking about it to any other parts of the community.

One analysis, two suggestions. The analysis is as follows. I find that over the past few years, the risk for ICANN becoming ever more schizophrenic is increasing, because on the one hand, you have extraordinary things, internationalization, opening of offices here and there, etc. But also a huge and excellent work which is done on accountability, for instance, which means actually reaching out to a wider community, more diversity, etc.

And on the other hand, I discover through all of these meetings this week, that some very basic problems remain. I want to concentrate on just one of those. Visas. Now, when I was the chair of the public

participation committee, and I know that Sébastien met the same problems during his term there, we tried to settle things.

I've analyzed this thoroughly, and during this week, I've taken contact with all sorts of people from all over the world. I think I have identified several layers of problems. Of course, there are administrative problems.

Of course there are staffing problems in ICANN, because as you know, Nick [inaudible] team is made up of five people, they're completely overloaded. You can't expect them to really deal with visa problems, but there are also sovereignty problems, as seen by nations who don't want to relinquish or weaken their rules.

So what I'm suggesting, and I would suggest that it would come perhaps as an ALAC proposal to the Board, is that the Board set up a taskforce for a limited period of time, made up of one, at least, member of the Board, plus volunteers who would be, from the communities.

For instance, one person volunteer from ALAC who you designate, etc. To actually look at all of the problems and not only one or the other aspect of it, which has been the case in the past. We have dealt with administrative problems, etc.

Now, my proposal would remain quite theoretical if it were not followed by a practical proposal, which is for the working group on accountability, which is to meet in Paris in something, mid-July, I

think, after our national celebration. I think we could make that a case study and try hard to settle all of the problems there.

I don't know if it would work, but we should really try and I think we owe it to all of our communities to try hard in coordinating this effort at all levels. So that in a few words, is what I wanted to suggest. It's really a group effort, because so far it has been led by staff at a medium level, with prodding from Board members, from members of the community, but it should be more coordinated. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We have a few minutes. I don't know if León and Olivier are and Maureen are cards on this issue or where we left off. Thank you. Olivier, you're on.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. I just wanted to pick up on what Sébastien had said, and the fact that we didn't need to be totally aligned on things. Yes, we need to row in the same direction, the same general direction. It would be terrible if each one of our delegates on this working group was to say something radically opposed to what the others were saying.

It sends a mixed message, it sends a message that, it's a message from Alan, from Sébastien, from Tijani, but with nobody from the community behind them. So we do need to align our messages when we are on the conference calls, but that said, if there are slight differences in the messages, and I've noticed that some, some might

be inclined to be for one model that might introduce more safeguards than another model where there is more trust involved, as long as we all have the general idea, general consensus to assume, you know, what we're all going towards, with the end result is that maybe that diversity of views will, as Sébastien said, reflect the diversity of the different regions that we come from.

But just be aware. Don't send mixed messages out there. I've had several people this week that have come to me and have said, "So, is this just Alan saying this? Or is the ALAC behind it? Is this just Sébastien saying this or is it the ALAC? Is it just..." And it just goes on like that. And that's a bit embarrassing, because I'll say I don't know, ask them. Why do you ask me?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Further comments. I think, on this subject of the CWG, we're going to have to have some interactions soon, and decide at what point we are. To be honest, my personal point is, I think we're past the point of posturing. We have to start getting down to details, because otherwise we're going to be the group that stopped the transition.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:

But he said CC, you said C. It's the CCWG.

ALAN GREENBERG:

There is only one now, it doesn't matter how many Cs we use. And I'm told we have a visitor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Welcome Steve Crocker. Is it one C or two Cs? We were just saying that we don't care if that we don't care now if it's CWG or CCWG, just one cross community working group on accountability, the other is over, and I made a bad joke when you came in. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: We now need to Cs in Crocker.

Welcome Steve. We do not have a particular agenda, you know, a long laundry list. We certainly want to talk a little bit about the Board ALAC format, because there are some strong comments on that, but I would like to give you a few minutes first to at least identify what issues you might want to talk about, or ask us any questions, and then we can get on to the specifics.

That maybe the only item on your list, in which case we can jump right into it. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: My very able staff has provided me with some comments, suggested comments here, some of them are sort of just ritual nature of thanking you and appreciating the work, which is, from my point of view, goes without saying. I know that the way that these sessions are referred to is skillet sessions, hot seat, but it's truly the case that I view this more like dessert.

This is a real pleasure. I've always enjoyed coming to these meetings. And so as far as I'm concerned, we'll talk about whatever we want, be as straightforward and direct, and it's refreshing. But I am glad that we want to talk about the constituency day interactions, that was frankly an experiment, motivated by a very particular interest in trying to make them more real, but with no guarantee that it would work out that way, or that would need some tweaking.

So we can talk about that. The ALAC support for the CWG proposal, is very important and was part of the unanimous movement of that proposal forward. That's a big, big step forward for the whole process, and very much appreciated. And I know from having followed all of the discussions that that was not a casual or pro forma action on your point. A lot of thought went into it, and a lot of concerns.

With that, let me turn it back over to you all. I mean, I've always been impressed with how ALAC has progressed over the years that I have been involved in, I applaud and look forward to more strength and more action.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Steve. I think the two things that have come out of our discussions, and we've had a fair amount of discussion informally and a little bit formally in this group, on the interactions, on the Board ALAC meeting. Certainly there was a lot of dissatisfaction with the physical format.

Those who were at the table were spread a mile apart. You and Fadi ended up sitting on the side of the table, with your backs to everyone. And lots of negative comments on that. So the physical format, I think, needs to be refined.

Describing it as a discussion between the ALAC and the Board, and then restricting it to six people from At-Large was really problematic. You know, other people may or may not have had other interventions, but being excluded from it, you know, being regulated to the back seats when only the important people were at the front seats, sent messages which were rather pointed.

So I think we need to rethink that. As you're probably aware, there were a couple of Board interventions which went on far too long and were completely off topic. And I don't know how you can control that. I've suggested at times that we have electrified cattle prods in the seats, but that probably won't go over real well.

So I think it was an interesting experiment. I think we have a fair amount of refining to do. I'll certainly let other people speak up. The other thing that came out of the meeting was, I got feedback from a number of sources saying we were, there were people on the Board who viewed that all we were talking about is we want more money.

Sometimes talking about money is unavoidable. If ICANN makes decisions, as they did in the visa case, because it was too expensive, it's hard not to talk about money. Certainly, we are not just in this to get more money, but occasionally dollars do have to come up in the

discussion. And, you know, if we can't talk about it to the Board, I don't know where we can talk about it.

So I'll turn it over to you briefly and then ask people, if anyone else wants to speak.

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me, I'm not at all defensive about this, but I do want to share sort of what the thought process was, which and then [inaudible] was a bit different.

The motivation, and I was centrally involved in moving it in this direction, was that the dialogue should be more focused, more intensive, have follow up and getting into some depth, and be bolstered with preparation, selection of topics, and preparations of the thought process on that, including selection of a good set of people from both...

[AUDIO CUTS IN AND OUT]

So that was the motivation. I think how it played out had weaknesses in several aspects of that. I suspect that the level of preparation was far less than I originally hoped it would be on both sides, and that the nature of the discussion that we wanted to have back and forth was not as, at the highest level, and focused on the topics. On the physical aspects, the image I had in mind was a much smaller sort of round table that was comfortable for say, 12 people, to sit at.

I was quite surprised and walked into the room and saw something roughly this size that we were all sitting around with sort of one person per table of this size, so it was... I had to keep a straight face. It was sort of the classic of, you know, what the customer asked for versus what the factory eventually built kind of thing.

Fadi and I, deliberately, sat with my back to the audience for a particular reason, which I can tell didn't work out very well, and at the end of the day, we wound up switching the other way because we got feedback that was consistent with what you were saying.

But I wanted the focus to be on the people who were facing the audience, and I kind of wanted to be out of the way. It didn't happen that way, I appreciate that. But that's just sort of a classic, unintended consequence as opposed to turning our back on the audience. Do take control. I mean this was, and go anywhere you want.

You say, no we don't like that at all, we liked it the way it was, we can go back, or you can say, well, nice try but here is the way to make something like that work, or whatever you want to do. It was a deliberate attempt at trying to make the interaction more effective, more real, so it's not just walking through the motions, and just draw a line there and say, that's the motivation and that everything else is in support of that, or is an implementation of that.

And if it didn't work, then we try something different. And that's really all that I have to say about that. You can... The only thing that I want credit for is that we took a stab at trying to do something different to get somewhere, and got no ego invested in that result.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just one or two quick thoughts and then Sébastien. It turns out Steve, that you're sitting there with the intent of not really interacting a lot. Well, it still conveyed, you're sitting with your back to us, but no, no. But you in fact didn't interact. You didn't participate very actively in the things. You had a couple of interventions.

Fadi, on the other hand, was very active.

Trust me I know. But because he was talking a lot, the back mattered a lot more for him than for you. Sébastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. I think it was a good try. You need to go back to the factory and try to find something else. And I just would like to put something on the table. If I remember well, it was three or four years ago, we tried a meeting where the people were at the center of the meeting room, and we, it's a time where we try with green card, yellow card, and red card, to see the temperature of the room.

I am not talking about this card. But I would think that if you just thank 12 share in a round circle in the middle of the room, and you allow people to sit around you, that you will see one back, but you will not see just your two backs, but you will see the other people, and you have moving microphone will be more interactive, more in motions, at this big table.

But it just suggestion, and I am not saying that it is the solution. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

As you undoubtedly understand, the logistics of setting up these meetings is a big deal by itself. So it's a room there and it gets set in a particular way, and the meetings team and the Board support team interact on all of this. There will be pressure from that quarter to do things in a similar way, and you know, however, from my point of view, my invitation to you is take that kind of suggestion, and push on it hard, and I'll be supportive, and we'll try to do something like that.

And we'll see, you know, what we can do that makes sense in a practical logistic sense, but also, that achieves those goals. Because I think the insight in how to make the interactions really work, are probably stronger here than in the people who are concerned with how do we get things to march on time, and you know, get the chairs arranged in a nice symmetric way.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have Olivier and then Tijani.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And my suggestion would be to have a horseshoe table, so you don't have the closed part that shows its back to the audience, and we would have probably been able, the size of the table that we had there, we would have been able

to put the 15 member ALAC, and the six Board members on there, and that would have probably gone for a good discussion among everyone.

So maybe a test for the next time. I don't know what the feedback is that you got from the other SOs and ACs, but obviously you're not going to change for each SO and each AC, change the room and so on, except if you decide to go for dancing chairs routines. But a part from that I should...

STEVE CROCKER:

But I'd rather start from, with a clean sheet of what you want, and then if there is a lot of diversity, then we'll figure out what that is. And then the other thing, of course, is earlier is better than later. So take this discussion, lay out what it is that you'd like based upon that, and drive it rather than having us drive it, and we'll take it seriously.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. Tijani speaking. Thank you Steve. I think that, as Olivier just said, setting the room for 30 people, a round table, is very easy. And it is a meeting between the Board members and ALAC members. We are 15 plus 15, so 30 persons around the table, it's very easy to do. And especially because the Board members don't come always together. So, if we make a table for 30 persons, it will solve all

problems. Everyone will be sitting at the same level, and the discussion will go well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I put myself in the queue, Sébastien next. I think, you know, Olivier said a horseshoe. I actually think the best ones are ones that we probably can't do in most venues. Every once in a while, you find curved tables, and you just have a nice arch, so everyone can see each other, but they're all still basically looking at the audience, physically that's a bit difficult in some places.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: The Board meeting needs an arch, doesn't it? The table we had yesterday, I think that was an arch.

ALAN GREENBERG: It might well have been. Certainly it would have been possible, some place if not others, we don't need to agonize over it here. I certainly don't mind if the Board feels that you can identify based on the topics, a smaller number of people. 30 tends to become a large number, I think, around the table.

So you know, I understand having an equal number, seems to make, makes things equitable between the groups, but you know, maybe we can have a hybrid, to use a CCWG term.

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me just emphasize a point. Some time ago, these meetings were setup as a kind of co-equal, both sides prepare topics, and the Board would send out the topics that we were interested in, and I notice that we were sending out the same set of topics from the Board side to every single group.

And it felt to me that that was not a useful thing to do. And so my thinking shifted from let's make this thing driven entirely by the set of topics that each group is interested, and be first in listening mode and in responding to that as opposed to saying, here is what we want to tell you all.

So in the same spirit, say how you want the interactions to go, say what you want the agenda to look like, and as I say, we'll do the best that we can to accommodate that, and that you shouldn't feel at all shy about doing that. The only thing, of course, is that sooner is better than later, because it takes a while to communicate and get everything set up that way.

So you know, we can have this interaction here and you can tell me that you want a table of 13, 15, or 30 and so forth. I'm not going to, unless you send notes, I appreciate if you would, but when we get into the planning process, which has to be fairly soon for Dublin, have somebody interact with Board support, and I'll be attended to that, and interact with me if you want, and let's just make this, the planning part of that, very real.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We will take it on as an action item to discuss it, and make a recommendation that we'll stand behind as a group. I have Sébastien. Tijani, is that a new one? Okay. Then again, quick interventions. Steve is not particularly limited, but we want to make sure that we can go on to various other topics if necessary.

Sorry, and we have, and sorry. After Sébastien, we have a comment from the remote participants, and then Tijani.

SEBASTIEN BACHOULETTE: Thank you. Just, because I heard a few times it is a meeting between the Board and the ALAC. And I am not sure it was the aim, it's a constituency day, and it's a meeting with the meeting with the constituency. That means that it's not a meeting with ALAC, it's a meeting with the At-Large participants at the meeting.

Like it's not a meeting between the GNSO or the BC leadership, it's a meeting with all of the BC member participating. And for me, it's a big difference, and I heard a few times that the ALAC members say that it's a meeting between us and the Board. And if it needs to be like that, so be it. But then why to make a circus?

Just have a meeting, and it's open, and we will watch you. But it was not the idea, at the beginning at least. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know if Murray can speak or if you want to read a comment, whatever.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Murray speaking, can you hear me? Can you hear me? I'll try to speak up, is that better?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Perfect.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you. Steve, it's Murray McKercher speaking for the record. I'm with NARALO and I'm calling in from Toronto. Just, Jean-Jacques has some important things so I want to get to him quickly, but I wanted to express the fact that we have this remote participation and my ability to actually speak to you, and see everyone, the video coverage really makes the interaction much better.

I felt a great part of this week's meeting through that process. So whatever we need to do to continue to support that, I just wanted to make that comment. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. I know that we were doing all of this. I had not been watching too closely how well it was working out, so it's very good to have that feedback. And clearly, it's quite obvious if we're part of the Internet ecosystem, we ought to be using the facilities, and we're going to be the leading edge instead of the trailing edge, so it's good to hear.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. As for the topics, so far, it is always ALAC who always propose topics. I would like to help the Board telling us what they want to know from us, so we will have some topics from them.

ALAN GREENBERG: As an example of that, I again got feedback that if we wanted to come and talk about the CWG, or CCWG, that would have been well received by the Board. We made a very conscious decision that wasn't what we wanted to talk about. So, if indeed that was a topic the Board wanted to hear from us on, we need to hear that from the Board.

We made decisions that there was an infinite amount of talking going on, as varied as the positions within At-Large are, our positions are well documented and well heard, and we didn't think it was a use, a good use of our time to repeat them in that forum, especially since there is a bunch of Board members who participate in the actual thing.

But again, if that's what you want to hear from us...

STEVE CROCKER: I'm trying to imagine a circumstance under which the Board would say to you, we want to hear from you about this particular topic. As

opposed to saying, you pick topics and we want to hear from you on the topics that are of concern to us.

The only thing that I can imagine is if there is something specifically burning about, and urgent about, something related to your group, some organization issue, or some political issue, or something. And we might say, hey, we're particular interested in hearing from you about this topic, although, under those circumstances, we probably wouldn't have to say it, it would be obvious anyway.

So I don't think we're bashful at all, we'd be happy to speak if we have something to say. But I just don't, I can't imagine a circumstance in which we would be useful for us to prompt a topic that would not otherwise be obvious anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Steve, thank you. That was my impression, you know, that we're being asked for topics, but this is not the first meeting that someone has come to me afterwards, and said, "If you had pick something, some other topic, we would have been really interested in hearing from you on it." Yes.

It happens almost every meeting.

STEVE CROCKER:

Do give me that kind of feedback. I mean, it's not a perfect process, but also, you know, logistics, the limitations of time. And I'm very, very conscious, just as we are here now. There is only so much we can

do in a given amount of time, and trying to get focused on making that time useful and meaningful on a smaller number of things, seems to me far better than any random scatter shot across.

On the other hand, perhaps Sébastien, I'm digesting what you were saying. That having simply the Board be accessible for open questions from everybody in an unplanned way has evaluated in its own right. And if that is, if that in your judgement, is a better way to use the time, I don't have any objection to that. And one can't do that and have a tightly focused discussion on a small number of topics.

So it's just a question of how we want to use the time. And the time is yours.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think the world has changed in the last couple of years. When we used to go in and say we would like to hear what the Board thinks about something, the answer was, the Board hasn't discussed this, if and when we ever discuss it, we'll tell you what we think. I think now we are in a world where we have Board members who are willing to say, this isn't the Board position, but.

So we may well be ready to go back to that kind of thing, where it wasn't ready for prime time before. But if indeed, there is a strong feeling among Board members that they would like to hear from us on something, you know, we may say no, we don't want to talk about that, but at least let's hear it, otherwise our crystal ball is sort of fuzzy.

And we can't always guess what it is, someone wants to hear us talk about.

I think we've exhausted that one. Anyone have anything different to talk about? Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT

Thank you Chair. It's always a pleasure to be with you Steve. I'd like to bring up something which I mentioned briefly to the ALAC leadership team a few minutes before you arrived. I find that, it's about [inaudible], by the way. I find that there is a risk of growing schizophrenia between two things, two great tendencies in ICANN.

One is the huge progress in globalization, in outreach, in transparency, in accountability, but then I find out, throughout this week, through public comments and the public forum, etc. that there is a very simple questions which has not been settled satisfactory yet, which is visas.

I won't go into all of the details, you know them, I know them, I've been on the Board, Sébastien was my successor at the public participation committee. We did all we could. During this whole week, I've been with a lot of people from Africa, the Middle East, and other places. And in the very free-flowing conversations, several times, the conversation has come back to their difficulties.

What I would like to suggest is that you setup, or we setup together, the Board with Fadi and members of the community, who are willing to contribute, a taskforce. Not a committee, a taskforce for a limited duration, and to achieve something very concrete, which is to help,

first, identify the problems. Because I have identified that there are several layers of problems: administrative, seemingly staff problems also in ICANN, because Nick [inaudible] has a team of five people for that, but they're completely overloaded, with very practical things to do, and visa is certainly not the thing that they can spend the most time on.

So the proposal is just to have a taskforce, I would suggest, but that's up for you to decide, that you find one good candidate from the Board, maybe ALAC would care to designate one member. I was thinking of asking NCUC to designate someone. This doesn't have to be on a preparatory basis, meaning each committee, or council, has to have a representative. That's not the idea.

We're aiming for efficiency. So those who are really willing to contribute, contribute. The second part of my proposal is very practical. Instead of just giving you an idea, I propose that we set this up quickly, so that the test bed would be very soon. The Paris meeting for accountability working group in mid-July. Those who don't have visa problems, fine. But there are a certain number of Visa problems looming on the horizon, and Steve you remember, yesterday during the public forum, there was that very outraged statement by the lady from Iran.

And I understand completely, and she was foretelling that she would find difficulties in Paris too. I'm willing to contribute very directly to this, because of my previous profession, and to try to settle all the individual cases which come up. At this stage, I don't think we can

find a sort of generic solution for all countries of the world. Let's start with something very practical, targeted on one country, and one event, Paris.

If that works, maybe you want to keep that going on for a few months, for other cases. Otherwise, I just take back my proposal. Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER:

It's a very vexing situation for the individuals, obviously, who are involved, and for all of us who are involved and want to make it go better. Jean-Jacques, you're making a set of requests and recommendations. I'm going to take a risk here and respond and push back a bit on some and tell you what the, how that fits in to what knowledge I have, and I have far from perfect knowledge, but I have some knowledge about the situation.

The effort that has gone into trying to help various individuals who have visa problems is quite extensive, far more than is visible. I don't know all of the details. I believe that there is a very natural tendency to keep those situations treated as private rather than massively public. So what we have is a set of individual situations and whatever the facts are, and whatever efforts have gone into that, is one layer of information.

And then in a handful of cases, pieces of those situations have become more publically visible. A particular person who was asked to spend four days from Gambia to Nigeria, I guess is the one that we've heard a lot about, and the costs of that, and what the responses are and so

forth. But that information is fragmentary, and is not completely laid out.

So I don't know, if we were dealing with this kind of as a judicial or something where there had to be a hearing about it, an awful lot more information would have to be on the table. I could imagine a situation which would lay out all of those cases, everything is public, and everybody gets to watch and see what's been done, what could have been done, and so forth.

I suspect that that's both unwieldy and counterproductive in terms of actually getting good results, and probably not comfortable, perhaps embarrassing perhaps even dangerous, in some cases, but in any case, not comfortable as the best way for handling all of those situations.

So when you're suggesting a taskforce, I'm not sure exactly what you have in mind in a practical, operational sense that does not already exist. We do know that visas are a governmental function, that ICANN is not a government and has no direct capability. We can facilitate, we can communicate, and so forth. We also know that there are some chicken and egg problems of you can't do this until you've done that, and you can't do that until you've done this kind of thing, that are just plain awkward.

You can't get an invitation until the meeting is set and so forth. So I don't know how much better we can do. If we could do better, we should do better. 100% agreed on that. But I'm also, I think we're long past the stage of well, we haven't done anything and we should get into it. So we're in that very awkward position of having done a

lot, not being satisfied with the results, and it's not 100% clear to me how much room there is for improvement.

If there is, we should try to understand that and do that.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT

Thank you. I would just like to briefly follow up on that Steve, answering your question. I am perfectly aware that a lot has been done. I know the people in the team, on the staff, do most of the stuff. I have identified, because, you know, that was my profession, to deal with international problems, a series of layered sort of problem.

And I think the novelty would be to approach all of those layers at the same time. About privacy, what I'm thinking of is a system which would be perfectly respectful of, for instance, the EU standards for privacy and the protection of personal data. It would not be, to be sharing with everyone in the taskforce personal data.

It's simply making sure that the mechanisms, the administrative mechanisms, the political level, etc. are warned about the type of problem. And then once that has been done, you can address to them a specific problem, a specific case to be settled. For instance, very simply, this morning over breakfast, several friends from Africa were telling me that sometimes, it's an unwillingness at the level of the government to be open about visas.

At other times, it's just the guy behind the counter when you get off the plane. So we have identified, and I am simply proposing to be

systematic about identifying all of the layers, and then to make a proposal. I could do this alone, but I'm proposing it be a team work.

STEVE CROCKER:

So in your suggestion, let me speak to two things. One is the implication at some level that we're not addressing all of those levels. And I don't know what the facts are. But the other is, at least from where I'm sitting, you've identified a particular level, and alluded to the existence of others.

Let me ask, as follow up to this discussion, I'm interested, send me an email, make sure we socialize with what you have in mind with the structure, what the different layers are, and then we can try to make something useful happen to all of that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. Steve, I hate to speak about this subject again and again and again.

STEVE CROCKER:

It must be about money.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

No, no. I will not. Have you ever heard me speak about money, Steve? Never. So my point is, as I explained it several times, I explained it in the meeting strategy working group, where I was a member, and we put it in our recommendation, what is needed from ICANN, I know ICANN is not a government. I know it is a sovereignty problem.

This is everything, I know it. And I don't want to change it. What I ask for is that we don't decide to hold the meeting in a country that don't accept, not to waive the visa procedure, not to challenge their rules at all, but to speed up, to make the procedure as swift for the list that you send. And the list would be the list of people who are elected, who are official of ICANN, who are members of the structure.

This is something which is possible, I think. It is not, I don't think we are asking for something that... The answer might be yes or no. Even if they say this one will not come, it is not a problem, because perhaps he has something and he's fine. We don't argue about it. But we don't want people waiting last minute and they can't come, only because the visa came late.

STEVE CROCKER:

This is not the only interaction I have had on this subject. And the Irish ambassador to Argentina was here, and to help invite us to Dublin. And so in the brief interactions that we had one on one with him, guess what we talked about? We talked about visas.

We had a Board member, [inaudible] from Gambia, we had any number of incidents in which he had troubles, and one of the more

humorous ones was that we had a Board retreat in Dublin, and he had a visa to get into Ireland, but he had to come through the UK, and the rules apparently had shifted so that even to transfer through the UK, you needed a UK visa.

And that was, this wasn't for lack of trying, the rules had changed. He found himself in the UK, stopped. Essentially, in some form of being under arrest. Very awkward. And a lot of high speed negotiation going back. The problem was resolved in the following way, which you'll find interesting.

They deported him, out of the UK, because he was improperly there without a visa. It was arranged to deport him in the direction of Ireland.

So we're familiar with, and particularly familiar with the Gambia, which of all things, I mean, Gambia is not a very big place, and it's, but anyway. We feel for this. Particularly for someone like me who is privileged to live in a country that is relatively unencumbered and can move around, I can tell that it would be very awkward to live in other kinds of places.

There is no place that's perfect. We know that the US is problematic for some people. There is no place in the world where everybody from every quarter would just be able to walk in, and it's ever more so under the ever changing geo-political we are in.

So we care a lot about this. So we'll see what we can do. Certainty is obviously a lot better than uncertainty, even if the answers are no, I

take your point. Trying to get governments to do that, and even when they try, there are big ponderous organizations, you know, they, it's not uncommon when you have a high profile meeting, for the word to go out from the central government to all of the councils saying all of the people who are applying for this should be treated...

For the word not to get there, for the consulate officials not to be behaving, so it's just an imperfect world. When we get everybody on the Internet, when we get all to be paying attention, we'll have things under control.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Steve. I want to belabor the point just a little bit. Because there are things that we can do. I'll give you several examples. When Beran was told by ICANN that she couldn't come because ICANN wouldn't pay the money, we certainly weren't happy, but it was done early, and we found a replacement participant.

He got his visa on the Tuesday before he had to leave, I think on the Wednesday. The same was true for several other Nigerians. The embassy in Nigeria swore, up and down, perhaps true perhaps not, the decision is being made in Argentina, we can do nothing.

So it's not only, assuming they weren't lying, and we have no way to know that, it wasn't that the message didn't get out to the field office. That's part number one. Part number two is I was told I have no idea whether it's correct or not, that the local host here refused to send a personalized letters.

That is, they sent out a generic one, whatever, and some embassies wanted personalized letters. So that kind of problem can be addressed. And the last one is, again for the case of the traveler we had replacing Beran, the local embassy in [inaudible] said we want the hotel to tell us they have a credit card for the reservation.

And ICANN's answer was this goes on to a general budget, we don't give credit cards. They should have given a credit card. You know? It never would have been used, but that would have taken a week off of the process. But you know, we were adamant that we don't use credit cards, the individual said give them my credit card, I'm happy.

You know, and that kind of, we're following rules we don't use credit cards, added, perhaps added a week to what we don't know for sure, but that was the reason the embassy was refusing to process it for at least that amount of time. So some of the things are under our control.

They may not be, make a substantive change in the end result, but at least we've got to get our act together. I only see Tijani's hand. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. What you just said about the credit card is only because the government hadn't been willing to speed up the process. They ask, they didn't ask for a credit card for me. Why? Because they have suspicion for this kind of nationality. It's clear. So, what I was

saying, if ICANN, before deciding on the venue, have an agreement with this country, not, as I said, nothing special, but I give you a list.

So when I will say they will be lodged in this hotel, they will be lodged in this hotel. This is a matter of trust. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll point out. When I went to apply for my visa for NetMundial, the guy behind the desk looked at me, and I looked as respectable as I ever do, and he says, "We want to see your tax forms and bank statements to prove you have sufficient funds." And refused to do it. This was on the Friday. I came back on a Tuesday, because Monday was a holiday, with my bank forms and tax forms, no sorry.

I came back on the Monday that was just before Easter Friday where they were going to be closed on Friday, and he looked at me, okay fine, but it's going to take a week to issue the visa. And of course, I had to leave five days later. They did issue it eventually, but you know, yes. Sometimes this is the guy behind the desk, and there is nothing we can do about it.

And I've been to Brazil before, nobody ever asked for my bank statements anywhere in the world, but he did. And he, there is nothing you can do about it.

STEVE CROCKER:

And just to make the point, there is no accountability, right? They're not accountable to us.

ALAN GREENBERG: ...accountable to their own people, because no one knows what they do.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, if you [inaudible] you didn't a visa, because [inaudible] don't need visa to go to Brazil.

ALAN GREENBERG: Canadians aren't trustworthy, we know that.

New topics. Barrack, or maybe I don't know.

BARRACK OTIENO: Just a suggestion that has maybe been belabored. I think there needs to be a concerted effort over and above just sending the efforts to sensitize the embassies about the ICANN meetings that are taking place, because personally I have noticed, if I go to an embassy, and they have some sort of information about the meeting, the way they handle us is slightly different from when you have to come and explain to them why you're going into this particular country.

And the first time I came to Argentina, I was actually taken aside at the airport. They were suspicious, because of drug related issues. But the second time, it was really easy going for me, both at the embassy and at the airport because they were informed in advanced.

So, maybe as the global engagement team carries out the engagement efforts, they need to reach out directly to the embassies. In the London meeting, even after several efforts of informing the British embassy, I was with ICANN staff and they refused to grant us visa, presumably because we are young. And they felt that we would not come back, probably.

So I think the effort is just to try and sensitize them about the importance of the ICANN meeting, also to them as countries. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll point out again, we don't have... Sébastien, I have you. We don't have full control over what the foreign ministry sends to the embassies. So, I have León then Sébastien.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Alan. I'm going to change a little bit the subject. I want to ask Steve his view on the world timeline on the transition. We are supposed to reply a reply to Larry Strickling's letter for the different working groups. I've seen so far, we're coordinating with the CWG and the ICG.

And I mean, I do have, as co-chair of the CCWG an idea of the timeline. But I would very much appreciate your input on how things are seen from the Board's point of view. And how many times we need to conclude the transition and ask the NTIA for an extension on the contract.

STEVE CROCKER:

I think Larry was pretty clear about what the picture looks like from where he is sitting, Larry Strickling, NTIS assistant secretary. The main focus from a timing point of view, is to have both the proposal from the ICG, and the proposal from the CCWG fully prepared and done, preferably prior to the Dublin meeting.

The optimum, at this point the optimum path would be for those proposals to be, have been transmitted, and at the Dublin meeting, we can make it clear to everybody, have a photo-op and have a formal transfer and so forth, over to NTIA. There is a little wiggle room if that gets missed, but only by a little tiny, tiny bit, not indefinitely, because stacked up behind that is a whole process.

And working backwards from the end of that process, there will be, assuming all of this is successful, there will be an end of the contract. In order for the contract to come to an end, there has to be a period prior to that where there are some implementations that are taking place prior to that, there has to be a certification to Congress from Strickling, that not only where the proposals acceptable, but that the bylaws have been adopted.

In order for the bylaws to be adopted, that means that the proposals have to have been done, and the Board has to go to work with the community. We don't adopt bylaws overnight. I mean, in some sense, looking, sitting from where I sit on the Board, and all of this focus about trying to make sure there are controls that that the Board

doesn't do anything totally out of synch with what the community does...

The Board is sitting there, stuck between multiple rocks and hard places, we navigate very, very carefully. We don't make policy, we don't do anything abruptly, we do a lot of public comments and exposure and so forth. So there is a certain irony about all of that.

And in particular, the changes to the bylaws have to be made in accordance to the bylaws. So we're not going to take a set of large changes to our bylaws, and have them presented to us and say, therefore they must exist. And say, wait a minute, it says in our bylaws, here is how we proceed. Yeah.

In fairness, an awful lot of the public process has taken place. So we're not going to try to ignore all of that or be totally duplicated. But we are going to be somewhat careful. So anyway, knitting all of that together is the challenging. Some of that, we can actually do, even right now.

And we can certainly do it even better when there is proposed bylaw changes. We don't have to wait for NTI to say it's okay, and in fact, if one thinks about it, it's up to us, the community, the Board, to make decisions about what changes we're going to make to ICANN.

It is not up to the US government to tell us what changes we can or cannot make. What they can tell us is whether or not they're comfortable with that set of changes, and based on that set of changes, whether or not they're going to take their hands off of the

contract or not. But the ownership of how we operate is ours, collectively.

Not just the Board's but the community's. So orchestrating all of that is very much on our minds. And getting that started as early as possible, so that there is a maximum amount of communication and coordination of that is what we need to do.

I don't know, have I answered all of the pieces of your question about the timing? I mean, there is some other sub pieces in there that I can fill in. Ideally, we'd have the bylaws adopted as quickly as possible. Even like the beginning, early part weeks of the next calendar year, and that means we've started the process earlier.

And then that puts NTIA into a position to be able to certify. Congress put a 30 legislative day, is the formula, pause between the time that it's certified, and if they don't take action, the time which is okay for it to happen.

And that has to be well before the end of the contract, 30 legislative days translates into, depending upon the calendar, somewhere between 45 and 60 calendar days, because they don't work weekends and they don't work lots of other days as well. So, it's a forced march, and if anything, if there is a major hiccup, then we have to recalibrate everything. Although, frankly, it's actually looking pretty good.

The counter balancing forces in Congress have all had their say, they've all made life as hard as the other side can tolerate it, the 30 legislative days for example, is one of those kind of bargains like, okay,

they've made their point and imposed their particular tax on the process, which is very different from saying, no it's not going to happen or it can't happen unless we say it can happen, and so forth.

So it's one of those practical bargains. And on whole, it's, from where I'm sitting, it's okay. If that's the worse it is, that's fine and we'll just move right past it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think Sébastien is next.

SEBASTIEN BACHOULETTE: Thank you. Thank you León for changing the topic, and I hope I have visa to jump into this discussion also. Steve, thank you for the answer. I have two comments. First of all, we have one liaison from the Board in the CCWG, and we have another Board member participating very actively.

They are both from the same place in this world. I really think that you may be willing to have more engagement from the Board, from other parts of the world, to this specific world, because accountability, it's not one way, it's a multiple way. It's a multiple way in this organization.

And the Board needs to be, from my point of view, more engaged. And I say that because I am in the awkward position, as I was Board member and I am member of the CCWG now. I have the impression sometimes I am the only who understands the Board, and who can

Speak about the fact that the Board is not, can be wrong. Can be going in one direction because 15 different people will never be on the same position if it's completely crazy and opposite to the community position.

And but there are people who have bigger mouths than me, as I talk and talk and talk, and I am not heard. And that's a pity. And as we want transition to happen, then people told me shut up, and I still think that it's not right, but it is the situation. And the second point, I have also the impression that people have a lot of dream about what is happening in the Board room.

And of course, the email that you give during the public meeting is not the reality of the in depth work done by the Board. Then may I suggest that you find a way to stop this letter, and to do a real Board in front of the community, just to show them that it's a work like any community in this organization, that you are nice people. You are talking to each other, but you are exchanging ideas.

At the end of the day, I think the Board may one day decide to have recording the session. I am not talking about all of the session, you know there are some specific issue we need to deal in-house. But there are room, but there are some things that can be done. And I think you, the Board, will be well, how we say, advised to think about that, and not to wait for the community to tell them, do that.

I hope it was clear. Thank you Steve.

STEVE CROCKER:

Two quick things. I do appreciate that the understanding of what the Board does and how it does it is pretty thin. And I appreciate that it's hard to get a sense of it, and you know full well, the complexities of what goes on in the Board. It's not an easy thing to get across because there is no session that one can sit in and see, oh, this is how the Board functions.

It functions partly in some meetings, partly in committees, partly in information calls, and lots of emails going on. And so one has to integrate over a period of time. I am wrestling with how to get the understanding of what the Board does presented in a useful way, because I think that's important, and at the same time, it's not instantly obvious to me how best to do that.

Ideas are welcome, but I say it's already a thought process that started and there is complexities, aside from the usual sensitivities about particular topics, it's just hard to pull all of these pieces together. And the other thing is, Sébastien, don't shut up. Keep at it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Steve. I've got a queue, and I would like to get onto the subject of ALS engagement for a few minutes before we break. And my recollection is normally the technical crew are going to want to strip this room down at 30 seconds after our finishing time of 12.

So it's a pretty hard stop, if we want to give...

STEVE CROCKER: And with apologies, I actually have an appointment at noon, so if we can have a hard stop at 11:55, I would find that to be helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. So we have 12 minutes, I would like to allow a few minutes for the ALS engagement. I have Ron and then Olivier.

RON SHERWOOD: Thank you. Ron Sherwood.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Garth.

RON SHERWOOD: Steve, I'd like to just step back a moment, you were talking about the process of approval of the new bylaws. Is there anything to the US Congress has to approve these bylaws before they can be, before the NTIA can approve the transfer?

STEVE CROCKER: Let me, the short answer is no, but let me be more expansive about this. The way I think about it, and I think it's a helpful way to think about it, is that there are kind of two layers to the approval process. As a matter of form, it's an ICANN issue what the bylaws are, and ICANN I don't mean just the Board or just the staff, I mean it's the community and so forth.

So, at that layer, bylaw changes get proposed, bylaw changes get socialized, the Board passes a resolution, suggesting the adoption of these bylaws, they go out for public comment, we integrate the public comments, and then we pass another resolution that says these bylaws are hereby adopted.

And then they put into force and so forth. And depending upon what the bylaws are, there maybe an implementation, or maybe the fact that it's adopted is all that is necessary, or there may be some conditionality, that all has to do with the details of each bylaw.

That layer, it's an internal, you know, within ICANN. Congress is sitting on the US government's side of the fence, and they're power in this is related to what direction they give to NTIA with respect to the contract. So, their completely decoupled in a certain formal sense, but in a practical sense, there obviously is a coupling, and that coupling is that if Congress were unhappy or failed to think that things were okay, they could make life difficult or impossible for NTIA.

What they did, for example, is they told NTIA in this wonderfully bureaucratic language is, you cannot spend any money on the transition. That is coded language for you're not allow to let the contract lapse. What has happened, and the state of affairs as I understand it is that they lower house, the House of Representatives, has passed legislation, and the Senate, the Upper House, is favorably inclined to adopt the same thing but it's still, as a matter of form, has to be worked out.

Legislation that, and assuming the President signs it, will say, as long as Larry Strickling certifies that the proposals have met the conditions that he has previously established, and that the resolutions, the bylaws to implement that have been adopted, that... And he certifies that to Congress which is a kind of a formal process of putting his own reputation on the line.

Then if they don't say anything for 30 legislative days, then that's all that's going to happen, and he has got the approval. They do not have to take an affirmative action saying, we hereby approve, they basically preapproved subject to being unhappy later and saying, oh, we're going to insert ourselves.

So the default is that it's done.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Olivier next.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Go to Garth and I'll think again, because I can't remember now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Garth.

STEVE CROCKER: Just take it easy and relax, it gets worse.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Go to Garth, yeah.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you Steve. Garth Bruen. So in one of our ad-hoc outreach sessions, we came up with the idea that we could possibly have a Board member rotating in and out of our At-Large meetings for maybe for one day, during the regular ICANN meetings, to serve, you know, from their At-Large Internet user perspective, and work with us for a day.

So we just kind of trade in and out these Board members, so that they can see what we're doing, see the work that we're doing.

STEVE CROCKER: Two comments. I don't know what the logistics of that would be, because I don't know what days we're talking about and so forth. And we do have some sessions in which we expect all Board members to be present. So that we can entertain that. I kind of like the idea of having different Board members go through the process.

Do you have merit badges of having, I've spent time with the, you know.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, did you remember?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: I did remember yes, and I managed to organize my thoughts as well, which was a little difficult considering the end of the week. A bit of warehouse with a few boxes lying here and there. Quite an empty warehouse, might I add. So, the Board has very strict conflict of interest policy when it comes down to discussions which involve Board members being conflicted in certain ways.

I understand that when a discussion takes place, they need to leave the room, or the conflicted members need to leave the room or not just refrain from actually voting, but I do have a concern.

And several concerns have been expressed by members of the community, with regards to the IANA stewardship transition, and with regards to the ICANN accountability process, where since the two are actually linked together, and some members of the community are participating in the discussions that are taking place in the room, about those, and the members of these communities are actually part of directly affected parties, the IANA contractor for example.

We do find that although there is no ability for them to vote, because we have a very open group with participants, they have the ability to actually weigh one way or another during the discussions that are taking place. And in fact, they have been occasions where they have been very vocal about with their preference, as to which way they would like things to go.

Do you see, as the Chair of the Board, and I know that the ICANN has been very hands off this whole process, but overall, it is ICANN that is

convening the process, do you see that there could be any conflict of interest in their intervention?

ALAN GREENBERG: For clarity, Olivier, you said the IANA contractor. Do you mean the IANA contractor or did you mean the root zone maintainer?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, root zone maintainer.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. I was curious about that. So without mincing any words, root zone maintainer is VeriSign, the discussions that you're talking about are, although ICANN was asked to convene these, or taking place... We don't control those discussions, so the CWG and the CCWG are operating under rules that they have adopted.

And so I have nothing to say about whether or not VeriSign is in the room or not in the room, except to say that surprisingly little of the discussions actually have focused on the role of the root zone maintainer, even though it's quite obvious something has to happen. Those discussions are sort of taking place in another arena.

With respect to ICANN people, I guess two thoughts. Generally, one of our broad rules about handling conflict of interest is disclosure. So we make a point for Board members to disclose all of their entanglements, if they have any. And then in some cases, they're excluded from certain kinds of discussions, because it's not just a

question whether they vote or even if they say something, but even if they're privy to information, it creates an appearance that they might be using that information or could use that information for something.

So we draw those lines depending upon what the circumstances are. But the first rule is make sure everybody understands what those entanglements are. So, if it isn't discussion about ICANN as the IANA contractor, it's obvious that if somebody is a Board member, that they should be seen as possibly having an interest of maintaining that contract.

And I don't think there is any mystery about that. If this is viewed as awkward, then we'll deal with that, but there is no... It can also be viewed as, okay, we know where you're coming from, and so we'll just take that into account.

There has certainly been a very, very strong orientation or sense that the ICANN Board is viewed as untrustworthy, self-serving, you know, resistant to the process. It won't come as any surprise if I tell you that I think all of that is greatly overblown, but we understand that that's an attitude that we can deal with.

It has made us much more resonate than we might have been. Probably not to the advantage of the whole process, but probably not so terrible. And so we just, you know, take that into account. We understand that this is a very emotional process, with lots and lots of points of view. And part of our job is to accept that as part of the reality.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Are you surprised about the lack of trust that the community has in the Board? That some segments of the community appear to have in the Board?

STEVE CROCKER: Yes. I'm not surprised that there are some vocal individuals, but frankly, I think there is a big mismatch between what we're hearing, and what the facts are. We do understand that that's kind of in the air, and that we have to deal with that in some fashion over time, but it's...

You know, I think it's peculiar, it's wrong, it's destructive, and unwarranted. Other than that, it's perfectly understandable.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We're now left with a minute for, to have this next topic. I'll simply give a quick overview of what we're planning, just so you're not caught unawares. As you know, we have close to 200 ALSs, I think over right now. As you also probably now, we've had significant problems over the last number of years, trying to actually get these ALSs engaged, and get significant people within the ALSs engaged.

We are embarking on a program that, in the absence of the CWG, would have started after Singapore, to put in place some processes and rules, so that we can try to better manage the interaction. We are

going to be requesting, or perhaps need, staff resources to help get messages out to collect things back, so that we have a better handle, at least, on what ALSs we have that are really live and out there, and trying to ensure that the ALSs do actually not only...

We don't only interact with the one representative from the ALS, but that we engage the ALSs themselves. So that's an ongoing process. We may be making some demands, which I'm sure will be perceived as the ALAC wanting more money, for staff resources to do it. And that's about the size of it.

And since you are being collected, thank you for spending the time with us. Thank you for spending a lot of time with us.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. On this last point, it would be interesting to have a sense among these 200 ALSs, sort of what the distribution is in terms of active, and participation versus kind of the fringe, whatever the tail of that is, of one person and so forth, just to get a better sense, and raise the visibility of the problem that you're wrestling with, as opposed to, you know, just a sort of demand for more resources.

But I think a shared understanding of the metrics of good, of some sort or another. And thank you. You've heard me get a little worked up here, but I'll repeat what I said when I came in, and which I always say. I truly do look forward to these interactions. It's, from my point of view, one of the very positive ends of the week for me.

And keep it up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Steve. Just for clarity, when I say resources, we're talking about a fraction of a person, probably for a period of time. We're not talking huge amounts. And those kind of metrics are exactly what we're looking for. I wish we had them right now, but we don't, and we're going to do our something-ist to make sure that we have in the future. Thank you.

Does anyone have any very quick interventions before your microphone is taken away from you? Sébastien.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Sébastien is stretching in the typical French way. I should do that too.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. With these speakers, if I don't have my earphone in, then I can't hear at all. Tijani has an intervention. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I would like, I will wish, I will hope that our two friends from France, Olivier and Jean-Jacques, in the future, give more power in their speech, in their words when they speak. Because I barely hear them. I am getting old, so I don't hear everything from...

When you speak very low, I don't know why you make, speak very low. I don't understand.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I'm not going to let you respond. You did it to me enough times, now I'm paying you back.

All of these microphone boxes have headphone jacks on them, and for the longest time, they were often not connected. They are now generally connected. Sometimes it doesn't always work, if in a big room, the head table may not be on this loop.

So it doesn't always work, but for those of us with hearing problems, it's a real boon. You may want to consider it. And now Olivier would like a word. Olivier, would you like to take the floor?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Yes please. Thank you very much. Can you hear me? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I do hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. No I think we have only like one minute left to this meeting. What I did want to do was to....

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]